

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MART LIIKANE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF SEATTLE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C05-1829L

ORDER REGARDING
MOTIONS FOR EXTENSIONS

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's Request to Re-Schedule Note to Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. #63) and on his Motion to Modify the Schedule (Dkt. #74). Plaintiff requested additional time to respond to defendants' pending motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff's response was due on January 8, 2007, and he filed it on January 10, 2007. The Court GRANTS plaintiff's motion to file his response late (Dkt. #63) and will consider his late filed response.

Plaintiff has also filed a motion to modify the Court's scheduling order to extend the discovery deadline, which was January 7, 2007. Plaintiff filed his motion after that deadline had already passed, on January 16, 2007. The Court's Minute Order Setting Trial and Related Dates states, "The Court will alter these dates only upon good cause

ORDER REGARDING
MOTIONS FOR EXTENSIONS - 1

1 shown: failure to complete discovery within the time allowed is not recognized as good
2 cause.” Plaintiff requests additional time because he “recently again had two heart
3 operations with many lab tests and follow-up tests and observations.” Plaintiff’s Motion
4 at p. 1. Plaintiff does not specify when the operations occurred. Plaintiff has stated in
5 other filings that the surgeries occurred years ago. Furthermore, plaintiff has not
6 identified the discovery he hopes to obtain. He filed his motion after defendants filed a
7 motion to quash his subpoena, in part because it purported to note a deposition after the
8 discovery deadline. That subpoena, however, was directed to defendants’ counsel and
9 was quashed as improperly seeking testimony that was privileged and documents that
10 were publically available. Accordingly, plaintiff is not entitled to additional time to
11 pursue that subpoena.

12 Finally, defendants have dispositive motions pending and are entitled to an
13 expeditious resolution of this case. Plaintiff has not alleged that he needs to conduct
14 discovery to respond to the motions. Accordingly, plaintiff’s motion to modify the case
15 schedule (Dkt. #74) is DENIED.

16
17 DATED this 5th day of February, 2007.

18
19 

20 Robert S. Lasnik
21 United States District Judge
22
23
24
25